



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                              | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/625,434                                   | 07/23/2003    | Gregg Scheller       |                     | 7873             |
| 23830 759                                    | 90 12/15/2004 |                      | EXAM                | INER             |
| KEVIN L KLUG                                 |               |                      | TRUONG, KEVIN THAO  |                  |
| ATTORNEY AT LAW 11237 CONCORD VILLAGE AVENUE |               |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| ST. LOUIS, MO 63123-2273                     |               |                      | 3731                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | ·  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |
|  | 10/625,434   | SCHELLER ET AL.                                      |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|  | Kevin T. Truong  | 3731   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply   |  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | action is non-final.   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex  | epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e 37 CFR 1.85(a).<br>jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of: <ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/22/04.   | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:                                     | (PTO-413)<br>ate<br>Patent Application (PTO-152)     |  |  |  |

Office Action Summary

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 6-7, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Siepser (U.S. 5,203,865).

As to claims 1, 6, and 7, Siepser discloses in figures 5 and 6, a blade having a V-shape tip (60), said tip (60) having a point (68) and a broad portion (located at 66), wherein said tip (60) having a first leg with a sharpened edge (76,78) and a second leg with a dulled edge (at tapered surface (80,82)); a tip holding shaft (64) connected to said tip (60) and further a cylindrical handle (62) connected to said tip holding shaft (64).

As to claims 18-20, wherein the Siepser device is capable of performing the method as claimed due to the fact that the Siepser device is for use in ophthalmic surgery.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3731

4. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siepser.

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the Siepser 's first and second legs at a degree and length as claimed, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in size of a component. A change in degree and size are generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Change in dimension, degree, size, ect. without special functional significance are not patentable. Research Corp. v. Nasco Industries, Inc., 501 F2d 358; 182 USPQ 449 (CA 7), cert. denied 184 USPQ 193; USLW 3359 (1974), In re Rose, 105 USPQ 137, and In re Aller et al., 105 USPQ 233.

5. Claims 2-5, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siepser (U.S. 5,203,865) in view of Ross et al. (U.S. 6,663,644).

Siepser discloses the claimed invention except for a depth gauge line disposed on the V-shaped tip (60). However, Ross et al teaches in figure 9, and col. 8, lines 61-63, a depth gauge line (24) disposed on the blade (tip (3)) to indicates the limit depth of penetration.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Siepser device with a depth gauge line on the Tip (60) to indicates the limit depth of penetration as taught by Rosse et al so that the Siepser device is constructed in a manner that minimizes the tolerance of the cutting depth into the eye.

Application/Control Number: 10/625,434

Art Unit: 3731

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin T. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-4705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Kevin T. Truong **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 3731

ktt